REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19, 22, 25 and 30 are amended, and claims 2 and 11 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter is added.

Applicants' appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the interview conducted with Examiner Lanier and Supervisory Examiner Barron on March 26, 2004. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, 17-22, 24-27 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Boebert et al. (hereinafter "Boebert"), U.S. Patent No. 5,502,766. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the interview, Boebert fails to disclose or suggest a previous key member unit for holding a previous key, the encrypting key generation unit also uses the previous key stored in the previous key unit in generating the encrypting key, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 10 and 18.

The Office Action asserts, on page 3, that Boebert discloses the keys can be stored in a database (key memory) for later use. However, it is respectfully submitted that Boebert discloses that the appropriate authentic key is only derived from a database, rather than using a previous key stored in the previous key memory unit in generating an encrypting key into the encrypting generation unit. In other words, Applicants' invention discloses that the encrypting key generation unit 105 receives the encrypting key from a key generation data memory unit 109 or previous key memory unit 108 to generate the encrypting key.

Accordingly, Boebert fails to disclose or suggest a previous key memory unit for holding a previous key, the encrypting key generation unit also uses the previous key stored in

-12-

the previous key memory unit in generating the encrypting key, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 10 and 18.

Claim 19 recites a data processing apparatus having a data generating apparatus and a data verifying apparatus. The data generating apparatus includes a data-for-main-checking check generation unit, a data-for-secondary-checking memory unit, an encrypting key generation unit, and an encryptor for encrypting the third data generated by the data-for-main-checking generation unit. The data verifying apparatus includes a reference value memory unit, a first data-for-secondary-checking memory unit, decrypting key generation unit, a decryptor and a verification unit. However, it is respectfully submitted that Boebert fails to disclose or suggest the particular recited features of claim 19.

Similarly, claim 30 also recites a data processing apparatus having a first device with a first data memory means and an encrypting means, and a second device having a second data memory means, a decrypting means and a verying means. However, it is respectfully submitted that Boebert fails to disclose or suggest the particular recited features of claim 30.

Because Boebert does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, it cannot provide the basis for a rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 7, 14, 16, 23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Misra et al. (hereinafter "Misra"), U.S. Patent No. 5,757,920. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Boebert neither discloses nor suggests Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in the independent claims from which the rejected claims depend. Misra fails to overcome the noted deficiency of Boebert. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert and Misra, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious the feature recited in independent claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19 and 30. Claims 3-8, 12-17, 20-29, 31 and 32, which depend from the independent claims are likewise distinguishable over the applied arts for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

II.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-10 and 12-32 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David J. Cho
Registration No. 48,078

JAO:DJC/brc

Date: April 7, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461

-14-